

DETROIT INTERMODAL FREIGHT TERMINAL PROJECT
Local Advisory Council Meeting
July 14, 2004
Notes
Revised August 17, 2004

Purpose: To review the progress of the Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal Project with members of the Local Advisory Council.

Attendance: See attached.

Discussion:

Introduction

Following introductions, Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that there were two new members of the LAC -- Maria Anita Salinas and Lucy Harrison. Kathryn Savoie asked for clarification as to whether each elected official had one appointment to the LAC and why that was the case. She also asked if each member on the LAC was representing an elected official. Thirdly, she wanted to know why Representative Tobocman had to withdraw Olga Savic as a member in order for Maria Anita Salinas to be appointed to the LAC.

Mohammed Alghurabi and Joe Corradino responded by saying that the original LAC formed in mid-2002 was drawn from appointments by various state and local elected officials from the area in which the Livernois-Junction Yard is located. Additional members were drawn from the community; many of those being representatives of Communities for a Better Rail Alternative. When the LAC was expanded at the beginning of 2003, because intermodal terminals were being considered for improvement/expansion in areas outside southwest Detroit, additional representation was requested by the state and local elected officials representing those areas. Representative Tobocman's district, when he assumed his position at the beginning of 2003, was represented by Ninfa Cancel, previously appointed by Belda Garza. Ninfa Cancel continues her LAC membership and Representative Tobocman, in his newly-elected position, appointed his representative, Olga Savic, to the LAC. In this one instance, therefore, District 12 has two representatives on the LAC. The request by Representative Tobocman to appoint Maria Anita Salinas would have meant that District 12 would have three representatives as part of the LAC. It was asked that that not be the case. In turn, Maria Anita Salinas was appointed to replace Olga Savic.

Kathryn Savoie asked if that meant that the community representatives were only a part of the original group. Joe Corradino indicated that all of the members of the LAC represent the community in some form regardless of whether they were part of the original LAC formed in the middle of 2002 or at a later time.

Maria Anita Salinas indicated that she was unaware her appointment to the LAC was done in the manner described above. She stated she was given her position “under false pretenses.” She also noted that she was never informed in writing as to her appointment to the LAC. She stressed that she has worked for over two years on the DIFT Project as a representative of Community Action Against Asthma and, therefore, should be able to have a position on the LAC on that merit, not as a replacement for Olga Savic. She also noted the lack of “color at the table” that evening.

Chuck Goedert asked if Representative Tobocman’s original LAC designee were removed for the substitution of Maria Anita Salinas. Joe Corradino indicated that was the case. He reviewed the process whereby Chuck Goedert was appointed to the LAC by the Ferndale government and indicated that the appointment process in Chuck Goedert’s instance as well as in the Maria Anita Salinas instance were the same, i.e., the original designee of Ferndale (City Engineer Chuck Tucker) was replaced by Chuck Goedert. Joe Corradino stressed that this was an effort to maintain balance among the various elected officials representing the community through their membership on the LAC.

Maria Anita Salinas again indicated that being a substitute for Representative Tobocman’s original appointment (Olga Savic) was inappropriate. Joe Corradino indicated that he had discussed this issue with Representative Tobocman and Olga Savic the morning of the June 9th LAC meeting and did not understand that Representative Tobocman had a disagreement with the request to substitute member Maria Anita Salinas for Olga Savic.

Maria Anita Salinas indicated that she would have further discussions with Representative Tobocman’s office on this matter.

Review of Meeting Notes

Mohammed Alghurabi asked if there were any comments on the notes of the meeting of June 9th. A typo in the middle of page 2 was mentioned by Chuck Goedert. He indicated that the complete comment should reflect that Joe Corradino indicated that “while he would try (to supply information in the LAC agenda packet in advance of the night of the meeting), it was unlikely he would be able to do so.”

Chuck Goedert also indicated that the following statement: “Joe Corradino noted that the project had been extended several months in order to analyze the composite alternative to the same level of detail as all other action alternatives” was not made at the June 9th meeting. Joe Corradino disagreed stating that he made the statement while there was some overlapping conversation by several members of the LAC and it may not have been heard by Chuck Goedert. Chuck Goedert again stressed that he takes detailed notes and that Joe Corradino’s comment was not made. Joe Corradino indicated that this disagreement would be mentioned in the notes of the ongoing meeting.

Air Quality

Mohammed Alghurabi referred to the agenda packet where an early EPA designation of the nonconformity of a five-county SEMCOG region for particulate PM_{2.5} was noted. Carmine Palombo indicated that SEMCOG, along with others, is requesting EPA to reconsider the designation of all five counties because some areas are marginally below the standards. He noted, as a result, it is likely that only two counties, Monroe and Wayne, will be included in the EPA nonconforming area.

Chuck Goedert asked what Carmine Palombo means when he indicates that an area is “marginally below the standard.” Carmine Palombo indicated that his reference to “marginally below” was likely inaccurate. He stressed that a couple of the counties now included in the area for PM_{2.5} nonconformance have monitors that are recording PM_{2.5} at levels that are not even near exceeding the standard. As a result, EPA is being asked to reconsider its designation.

Joe Corradino noted that air quality data provided on page 13 of the agenda packet reflects information from EPA’s Web site. That information indicates that the number one particulate matter producer in Michigan is the Research and Engineering Center. Those data, produced by

EPA, are incorrect. The Research and Engineering Center produces 3.2 tons of PM_{2.5} annually, not 3,209.

Joe Corradino went on to say that data on page 12 of the agenda packet is the corrected version of information provided in the June agenda packet dealing with pollutant burden calculations for each terminal area. Joe Corradino noted that there were a number of miscalculations in the data presented in June and they were corrected in the current information. He particularly noted, in response to Chuck Goedert's earlier interest in the Canadian National terminal area, that the 2004 calculations for PM₁₀ were reduced from 11 to 5 tons annually. This reduction is the result of an adjustment of the dust-generating parameters used in the modeling process. The dust-generating parameters for the CN terminal under No Action conditions were inconsistent with those required for that area and were inconsistent with the calculations applied at other terminal areas.

Chuck Goedert asked for the location of the monitoring station closest to the CN/Moterm terminal. Joe Corradino had difficulty naming the location. A member of the audience indicated that that station was at Oak Park. Joe Corradino agreed.

Chuck Goedert asked additional questions about the dust modeling and the adjustments that Joe Corradino noted had been made in the updated data set. Joe Corradino indicated that there are EPA indices used for modeling the different activities in the terminal area. The information for dust is drawn from an EPA publication known as AP42. He further indicated that EPA indices extend to types of engines, types of fuel, fuel mix and the like.

Joe Corradino indicated that the age of equipment is also an important factor in calculating pollutant burden. For on-terminal equipment, an inventory was made of the age of equipment at each of the terminals. At the CN terminal, the equipment was about five years of age. Therefore, for the calculations in 2025, the equipment was assumed to be five years old.

Joe Corradino noted that the activity at the CN yard was different in terms of the horsepower of the locomotives and other equipment as compared to the other terminals, i.e., lower horsepower equipment is being used by CN than, for example, CSX at the Livernois Yard.

Kathryn Savoie indicated that the table of data in the agenda packet to which Joe Corradino was referring was difficult to read. Joe Corradino noted that the information was available on the DIFT Web site.

Chuck Goedert asked if there were a determination for each terminal of the extent to which it is unpaved. Joe Corradino indicated that each site had been visited to make that determination and discussion had been held with the terminal operator.

Traffic Assignment Adjustment

Joe Corradino referred to the agenda packet and a graphic placed on the meeting room wall to discuss adjustments that had been made to the layout of the Livernois-Junction Yard south of Kronk Street. He noted that the LAC was advised at the May meeting that these adjustments were being studied and the results would be brought to the LAC at the July meeting. The adjustments reflect that Norfolk Southern's Triple Crown operations were being moved so access would be provided off Wyoming Avenue as compared to Livernois Avenue. Additionally, Conrail was being accommodated on the site. As a result, the movement of trucks between a gate at Wyoming and a gate at Livernois on an internal terminal road was no longer possible. This, in turn, causes the potential shift of 800 to 900 trucks per day (two-way) in the year 2025 from Livernois Avenue to Wyoming Avenue. Because of the shift, the DIFT Project Team has decided that two scenarios would be used to assign traffic for the Livernois-Junction Yard terminal area in each of Alternatives 2, 3 and 4.

In response to a question about why this shift was needed, Joe Corradino indicated that positioning in the terminal is key to the efficiency of railroad movements. A location in the yard could affect the movement of a train by several hours. Therefore, Norfolk Southern's movement of its Triple Crown operation is likely affecting the overall time that it expects it can receive and dispatch trains at the Livernois-Junction Yard.

FHWA Letter

Joe Corradino referred to a handout of two letters from the Federal Highway Administration: one to Representative Tobocman and other state legislators; and, a second letter to Kathryn Savoie. Both letters were in response to requests that FHWA reconsider the approach to the DIFT air quality analysis, particularly in the area of health risk assessment. The FHWA letters

indicated that the DIFT air quality methodology had been revised to include the calculation of terminal area pollutant burdens for a number of air toxics from mobile sources. Joe Corradino again stressed that the analysis would be done for an area that includes and surrounds each of the terminals. In those areas, calculations will determine the burden of the pollutants covered by the National Ambient Air Quality Standards to the burden of mobile source air toxics. He also noted that dispersion analysis would be done to calculate the concentration of carbon monoxide at a number of “hot spots” around each terminal.

Kathryn Savoie asked where the hot spot locations were. Joe Corradino referenced a number of places along Livernois, Central. Kathryn Savoie asked if there were spots along Wyoming in Dearborn. Joe Corradino indicated that there were, north of Michigan Avenue and south of the Livernois-Junction Yard.

Maria Salinas asked if the analysis would include what she referred to as ultra-fine particles. Joe Corradino indicated that the analysis would deal with diesel emissions and PM_{2.5}. Maria responded that she has greater concerns with “ultra-fines.” Joe Corradino stressed that the air quality analysis would include diesel emissions and PM_{2.5}.

Joe Corradino indicated, in follow-up to a question raised at the previous LAC meeting on pollution being generated by on-road versus off-road equipment in the terminal area, that the split was, generally speaking, 75+ percent of the pollutants being generated by off-road equipment and 25 percent or less by on-road equipment.

Kathryn Savoie stressed that she had not received a letter from the Federal Highway Administration to which Joe Corradino was referring. Joe Corradino indicated that, in his comments, he was not attempting to address the health risk assessment issue that the letter to FHWA from Kathryn Savoie, et al., mentioned but rather the indication by FHWA that mobile source air toxics would be considered in the DIFT analysis.

Paul Nye asked for an explanation of the drawings in the agenda packet and the reference to a truck-only road. Joe Corradino and Jim Hartman indicated that the drawing was intended to demonstrate gate locations and the reference to the truck-only road was incorrect. Paul Nye

asked that the fact that the truck-only road was incorrectly shown and is no longer an option be cited in the notes of the meeting.

Social/Cultural Interviews

Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that the agenda packet included the number of social/cultural issues interviews completed to date.

Chuck Goedert asked the format of the interviews. He additionally commented that he was of the opinion that the interview with the group called I-CARE was not conducted by the standard format. Joe Corradino indicated that the five areas in which questions were asked are: Community Facilities, Community Services, Issues/Concerns Affecting the Population; Future Opportunities; and, Other Issues.

He indicated that the interviews touch on each of those topics and each interview is done in an informal context. With respect to the I-CARE interview, Joe Corradino cited a number of items that were covered in each of the several categories of information.

The question was then asked who conducted the social/cultural interviews. Joe Corradino indicated that Harvey Santana, Guy Corradino and Nicole Corradino conducted the interviews.

Maria Salinas indicated that she believed that interviews were to be conducted in a very prescriptive way and not in an informal fashion. Joe Corradino noted that a script is followed in a formal polling exercise. However, this was not intended to be a poll but, rather, a discussion of issues as he noted earlier.

Kathryn Savoie indicated that a number of people who were interviewed know nothing about the DIFT and, therefore, questioned how could they conduct an evaluation of social/cultural issues as they relate to the DIFT. Joe Corradino indicated that the interview was not intended to have the interviewee conduct an evaluation of the DIFT. Kathryn Savoie referred to the heading on the interview form as the “Social/Cultural Effects Evaluation.” Joe Corradino indicated that the evaluation was to be conducted by the MDOT Project Team and that information requested from the interviewees was to establish the elements of the community upon which the evaluations

could be made in part. If those interviews reflected on the DIFT or its associated activities, such comments were noted.

Kathryn Savoie indicated that a number of key organizations from the Arab community were not represented in the completed interviews. As a result of that discussion, contacts were once again solicited and it was noted that follow-up attempts would again be made to collect information.

CBRA Meeting

Mohammed Alghurabi noted that Communities for a Better Rail Alternative had a meeting on June 24th dealing with the DIFT. He invited Kathryn Savoie to review the results of that meeting. Kathryn Savoie indicated that she chose not to. She indicated that CBRA has had a number of meetings from time to time, and, when it is appropriate, those activities will be reported to the LAC. She stressed that she did not believe that placing CBRA as an item on the agenda was appropriate.

Joe Corradino responded that Karen Kavanaugh, Co-Chair of CBRA, had requested information from the DIFT team for use at the June 24th meeting and had indicated that, following the meeting, she would provide some indication of its results. Therefore, Joe Corradino placed the item on the agenda. Further, he noted that the agenda is distributed to LAC members in advance of the meeting and, if an item were a problem, he expected it would have been noted earlier. Kathryn Savoie reiterated that she had no report at this time on CBRA's meeting.

Maria Anita Salinas indicated that she also objected to the CAAA being listed on the LAC agenda. Joe Corradino responded that information distributed by CAAA about the DIFT was a matter of importance to the project and to the LAC members. Further, Maria Anita Salinas had indicated at the May 12th meeting that CAAA would have no problem responding to the issues brought up at the LAC meeting with respect to CAAA's representations, included in a flyer about the DIFT. Joe Corradino indicated that no response had been forthcoming for Maria/CAAA.

City of Detroit Meeting

Mohammed Alghurabi noted that the DIFT Project Team would meet with the Detroit City Council on July 15th. This meeting had been requested by City Council through the City

Planning Commission. Chuck Goedert asked if there were any agenda for that meeting. Mohammed Alghurabi noted that it was an update of the status of the DIFT, to the best of his knowledge. He indicated it was a City Council meeting and, therefore, MDOT was not preparing the agenda.

Other

Kathryn Savoie mentioned that at the June LAC meeting, she had volunteered to provide a pamphlet produced by EPA dealing with diesel pollution. The pamphlet was distributed.

Greg Gorno stressed that the railroad/logistics industry has additional information with respect to regulations on diesel engines and pollution and the industry's compliance. He offered to make that information available.

Paul Nye then asked for a few minutes to read a letter sent by Ford Motor Company to MDOT Director Jeff and Dave Hollister, Director of Consumer and Industry Services. The following was read:

“Dear Directors Hollister and Jeff:

“Ford Motor Company has evaluated MDOT’s most recent Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal (DIFT) plans which have resulted in a reduction in scope from previous planning. We are relieved that our most serious issue with the previous proposal has been addressed, however selection of the Livernois Rail yard for consolidation and the impact of concentrating additional traffic in a densely populated, high traffic location remains a concern.

“Ford Motor Company supports intermodal transportation as a strategy to reduce regional highway congestion and improve air quality. Unfortunately, our requirements continue to be misunderstood; Ford does not have a projected a need for incremental intermodal services. Our manufacturing operations are based on Just In Time (JIT) deliveries which intermodal transit times and dependability cannot be relied upon to sustain lean manufacturing processes.

“Ford Motor Company does use intermodal on a limited basis where transit time and delivery frequency are not critical to our needs. On occasion we experience slight shifts in demand and often speculate on transit mode conversions; however, it is important that MDOT’s study team not misinterpret minor speculations as a change in need. Ford’s overall business plan for intermodal services is projected to remain flat into the foreseeable future.

“Ford Motor Company remains actively involved with the communities surrounding the Ford Rouge Center (FRC). The logistics plan supporting the flow of components into FRC and finished vehicles out of FRC was designed with the input of community representatives and addressed the needs and concerns brought to our attention during the developmental phase. We encourage MDOT’s continued engagement of community and business representatives; a similar balance of needs on the DIFT must be achieved.

“Our representative participates regularly in the LAC and Steering Committee discussions on DIFT and will continue supporting the process. If you have any questions or required additional information, please contact Paul Nye directly for further assistance. We look forward to our continued engagement.”

Paul Nye noted the letter was signed by Dennis Profitt, Ford Director of Manufacturing at the Ford Rouge Center.

Maria Anita Salinas then discussed CAAA’s concern about how the LAC business was conducted. She indicated that the CAAA includes representatives from organizations, such as the University of Michigan, and it is their belief that MDOT is censoring information. She distributed CAAA’s letter on this matter and indicated that she would appreciate the LAC reading it so that it could be discussed at the next LAC meeting.

Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that MDOT is not censoring and has not censored any information. He stressed that the LAC is an MDOT-supported group and, therefore, MDOT had requested a copy of the presentation that CAAA wishes to make to the LAC be made available to it in advance of the meeting. He also indicated that his request was consistent with the position of LAC member Bill Schrader who articulated at a February 2004 meeting that the CAAA presentation be provided to MDOT so that it could then be distributed to the LAC.

Maria Anita Salinas asked that CAAA be permitted to be on the agenda to make its presentation to the LAC. Mohammed Alghurabi asked if she wanted to be on the August agenda. She indicated that that was not possible and she would talk to her supervisor about being on the September agenda.

Public Comments

Janet Narich asked about data that were produced in the M-1/M-102 Environmental Assessment with respect to the number of trucks attributable to the DIFT activities at the CN/Moterm terminal. Joe Corradino indicated that, while he did not have the M-1/M-102 document in front

of him, he believed that the information to which Janet Narich was referring was the increased number of trucks at the CN/Moterm terminal over the No Action alternative. Generally, he recollected that the increase was in the range of 300 to 400 trucks per day (two-way) in 2025. The information that had been discussed earlier in the LAC meeting of 650 to 700 trucks per day was the total including the No Action and expansion amounts of traffic at the CN/Moterm terminal.

Janet Narich asked if the CP/Expressway terminal were closed, was it still going to be included in the DIFT Environmental Impact Statement. Joe Corradino indicated that it would be. He further referenced that a meeting was held between Canadian Pacific and MDOT indicating that, while CP had temporarily suspended its operations at that terminal, it was intent on re-entering the market. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that CP/Expressway has a contract with MDOT for mutual responsibilities in developing/operating the CP/Expressway terminal.

Lisa Goldstein objected to CBRA activities being listed as an item on the agenda. She indicated that, if CBRA were on the agenda, advance notice was appropriate. Mohammed Alghurabi and Joe Corradino indicated that CBRA members of the LAC were provided a copy of the agenda in advance of the meeting. If there were an interest in having the agenda adjusted, the offer was always available to do so. Paul Nye indicated that he heard repeated several times at this meeting that the agenda was available for LAC comment and action and, therefore, LAC members should take that into consideration in the future.

Byna Camden asked Paul Nye if he were a member of the LAC. Paul Nye indicated that he was. Byna Camden noted that his name was not included on the LAC list distributed as part of the agenda packet. Paul Nye noted that must have been an oversight. Joe Corradino indicated that Ford had been assigned a representative on the LAC from the very outset and that the original member (Pam Stec) had been replaced by Paul Nye. The absence of Paul Nye's name on the LAC roster would be corrected.

Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that, in response to the information distributed by Maria Anita Salinas, which included a request that Mohammed be relieved of his role in coordinating LAC discussions, that his boss, John Polasek, had sent a letter to CAAA indicating that Mohammed

Alghurabi would continue in his role at all LAC meetings as well as project manager of the DIFT.

Olga Savic stressed that, in light of the complexity of the air quality discussion, every effort be made to simplify the presentation in the EIS, including the use of easily understood graphics. Olga Savic also asked about the CP contract with MDOT. She indicated that her understanding is that MDOT advanced a loan to CP with certain conditions on its repayment. She wondered what those were. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that there was a contract. The issue of loan payment/repayment would be addressed by MDOT based upon whether CP re-enters the Expressway market in the last year of the contract.

With that comment, the meeting adjourned. It was noted that the next meeting would be August 12th.

L:\Projects\2846-A\WP\notes\LocalAdvisory\July14-2004.doc

DETROIT INTERMODAL FREIGHT TERMINAL PROJECT

Local Advisory Council Meeting

July 14, 2004

Attendance

LAC Members

Name	Representing	Address	Phone
Mohammed Alghurabi	MDOT – Project Dev.	425 W. Ottawa, Lansing	
Todd Birkle	Oakland Content		
Don Cameron	FHWA	315 W. Allegan, Lansing 48933	
Ninfa Cancel	Det. Hispanic Dev. Corp.	1211 Trumbull, Detroit 48216	
Chuck Goedert	City of Ferndale	821 W. Breckenridge, Ferndale 48220	
Lisa Goldstein	SDEV	1450 McKinstry, Detroit 48209	
Marc Higginbotham	Norfolk Southern	2000 Town Center Ste 1900, SF 48075	
Paul Nye	Ford Motor Co.	The American Road, Dearborn 48126	
Carmine Palombo	SEMCOG	535 Griswold, Suite 300, Detroit 48226	
Maria Salinas	CAAA	3285 Springwood Ct., Orion, MI 48359	
Kathryn Savoie	ACCESS/CBRA	6450 Maple St., Dearborn 48126	
William Schrader	Jeffries/Southfield	13570 Auburn	
Gail Yeager	Amer. Ind. Health	4880 Lawndale, Detroit 48210	

LAC Observers

Name	Representing	Address	Phone
Kim Anderson	R. E. Leggette	9335 St. Stephens, Dearborn 48126	
Scott Bradford	Green Acres/I-CARE	21003 Renfrew Rd., Detroit 48221-1391	
Chris Brayman	Dearborn Police Department	16099 Michigan, Dearborn 48126	
Karoy Brooks	I-CARE/Palmer Woods Assoc.	19300 Afton Rd., Detroit 48203	
Carolyn Buell	League of Women Voters	642 Meadowlane Rd., Dearborn 48124	
Byna Camden	Green Acres/I-CARE	2575 Woodstock Dr., Detroit 48203	
Susan Cilluffo	Gleam Co Motor Carriers Teams	2734 Eagle Crt., Roch. Hills 48309	
Marty Connour	MARS Industries	3100 Lonyo, Detroit	
Jeff Edwards	MDOT – Metro Region		
John Edwards	Grandmont resident	14401 Woodmont, Detroit 48227	313-838-7316
Anita Flies	Green Acres/I-CARE	20059 Briarcliff, Detroit 48221	
Greg Gorno	Det. Intermodal Assoc.	18673 Dix, Brownston, MI 48192	
Kimberly James	Detroit City Planning Comm.	202 Woodward	
Ken Kucel	Wayne County DPS-Engineering	415 Clifford, 4 th Pl., Detroit 48226	
Jason Maciejewski	Wayne Co. Exec. Robert Ficano	600 Randolph, 3 rd Floor, Detroit 48226	
Paul Max	Detroit Dept. of Health	1151 Taylor, Bldg #4, Detroit 48202	
Janet Narich		706 Pinecrest, Ferndale 48220	
Anthony Newell	ARME-ARBE State Fair	411 Fernhill, Detroit 48203	313-492-3281
Jason Newman	FHWA	315 W. Allegan, Room 201, Lansing	
Brenda Peek	MDOT – Comm	18101 W. 9-Mile Rd., SF 48075	
Sherry Piacenti	MDOT	P.O. Box 30050, Lansing 48909	
Dorothy Pierce	Green Acres/I-CARE	20436 Briarcliff, Detroit 48221	
Olga Savic			
Chris Singer	Detroit News		
Jeff Tumdanish	Resident	6906 Longacre, Detroit 48228	
Alexis Zavala	DHDC/CAAA	1211 Trumbull, Detroit 48216	

L:\Projects\2846-A\WP\notes\LocalAdvisory\July14-2004.doc